VOLUME VIII NUMBER 1

The
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

JANUARY 1934

RECENT PROGRESS IN RESEARCH IN ANABAPTIST HISTORY*

By Harold S. Bender

The bloody hand of persecution crushed the most truly "popular" movement of the Reformation, the Anabaptist movement, a movement which aimed not merely at the revision and reformation of the existing religious order, as did the reformers, but at the displacement of this order by a new and truly Christian fellowship of believers in the world. Unnerved by the peasants' war, frightened by the fear of the possible disintegration of the general Christian society, encouraged and indeed incited by the leading reformers and theologians, the civil authorities, both Protestant and Catholic, lost no time in throttling what was becoming in the year 1525 and the following years a powerful movement in the hearts of the common folk. By the year 1529 Christendom had proscribed the movement with remarkable unanimity. Damned by the reformers as abominable heretics subversive of true Christianity as well as a serious danger to the Christian state, hounded as dangerous revolutionaries by the civil authorities aided by a special imperial police, these simple Christians fought a losing fight. The tragic episode at

* A paper read before the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Church History in New York, N. Y., December, 1930. The author is greatly indebted to the splendid historical survey of Anabaptist historiography by Christian Hege in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* in the article entitled "Geschichtsschreibung", for material used in the earlier portion of the paper.

Muenster in 1534-35, though it had very little to do with the real movement, confirmed the worst fears of both theologians and princes. Muenster was to them an incontrovertible demonstration of the satanic origin and character of the movement, a demonstration which made its eradication the prime duty of those who were charged with responsibility for church and state. Within the confines of the Empire the eradication was fairly complete, although the struggle lasted almost a hundred years. By the time of the Thirty Years' War there was (in the original Swiss-South German home of Anabaptism) but a handful left in outlying districts in certain of the Swiss cantons, and a few scattered families elsewhere in South Germany.

On the fringes of the empire however in two widely separated regions, two branches of the great Anabaptist family were able to maintain themselves and prosper in spite of periods of severe persecution. In Moravia the Hutterian Brethren succeeded in establishing a large number of communistic "households" (Bruderhöfe) with a membership estimated variously at from 30,000 to 70,000. They played a significant part in the economic life of that backward region. However the Thirty Years' War and the later Jesuit reaction under Maria Theresa wiped out the Hutterites except for a few families, thus destroying one of the most remarkable flowerings of the Christian religion in our era, the only instance of the permanent creation of a true Christian Communistic society.

In the Low Countries, in Flanders and Holland, the Anabaptist movement struck deep roots, and in the late sixteenth century threatened for a time to become the most numerous religious body in the land. The Brethren there, after a period of struggle, had peace and prosperity. Becoming wealthy, influential, and socially powerful they were gradually transformed from a simple brotherhood into what approached a "church", and finally, in the nineteenth century into a religious group dominated by pastors and theologians with a predominantly liberal theology. As a result the present Mennonite Church in Holland does not bear as close a relation in faith and principles as might be expected to the ancient Anabaptist brotherhood from which it has descended.

By a series of migrations, following the Thirty Years' War, sections of the remnant of the Swiss Brethren left their homes in the cantons of Berne and Zurich during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and settled in Alsace, the Palatinate, Baden, and, from 1710 on, in Pennsylvania. All of the American Mennonites (with insignificant exceptions) east of Kansas and Nebraska, are

descendants of this group. By another series of migrations beginning about 1540 a segment of the Dutch Brethren together with remnants of the original movement in a few north German cities found its way into the region of the delta of the Vistula in West and East Prussia about Danzig. After 1785 on invitation of the Empress Catherine of Russia, several thousand Prussian Mennonites settled in the Ukraine and Crimea in South Russia. A part of these again (1874-1880) came to our own great American plains from Kansas on up into Manitoba.

The remnant of the Hutterite families who had escaped the Jesuit terror made their way from Moravia and Hungary into South Russia likewise at the end of the eighteenth century, and finally found their home in the American Dakotas about 1875. Since the World War they have practically all migrated to the prairie provinces of western Canada, where they constitute a total of possibly 4,000 souls to-day. A small remnant remains in South Dakota.

Thus in spite of the most desperate attempts of civil and ecclesiastical authorities to crush the Anabaptist movement there are in our western world, in both Europe and America, large groups of Mennonites, approximately 500,000, all bodily descendants of the Anabaptist Brethren of the Reformation Period. They have come to be known as Mennonites, after Menno Simons, the chief leader of the Dutch wing from 1536 to his death in 1561, although the descendants of the Swiss Brethren never were truly followers of Menno.

The ultimate and true history of this significant Christian group, the Anabaptist movement, has not yet been written. The same iron hand which crushed the *life* of the movement and destroyed its leaders in the early years of its history, also forcibly throttled its *literary expression.* The Brethren were denied access to the press. Later, after the fires of persecution had died down, the remnants of the movement were happy merely to be left alone in peace; the thought of literary expression or propaganda was far from them. Except for a few booklets by Hans Denck (d. 1527) who was not a typical Anabaptist but rather a Spiritist, and some valuable writings by Balthasar Hubmaier (d. 1527) who had his own printing office in Moravia, practically no Anabaptist literature reached the press except in Holland and Northwest Germany. Notable exceptions were the so-called *Schleitheim Confession* or *Bruederliche Vereinigung* of 1527, Pilgram Marbeck's *Vermanung* of 1542, and the *Ausbund,* the hymnal of the Swiss Brethren, which

had its first edition in 1564. The movement in the Low Countries found more toleration and produced in the Dutch language considerable literary material which has come down to us, such as the writings of Menno Simons (written in the period 1539-1561) and the *Enchiridion* of Dirk Philips, the *Martyrs' Mirror* of 1660 which had its beginnings in the earlier *Het Offer des Heeren* with its first edition as early as 1562, also hymnals, confessions, and apologetic and dogmatic as well as historical writings of more numerous and varied character in later times. The only known publication of the early Hutterites which has been preserved is the important *Rechenschaft unseres Glaubens* by Peter Riedemann, first published about 1545. In view of this scarcity of published Anabaptist literature, it is justifiable to say that the same hand which crushed the life of the Brotherhood stilled its literary voice. But the voice of the Brethren was nevertheless heard; it was heard in the numerous trials before the magistrates and in the theological disputations so characteristic of the Reformation age in which they were often compelled to take part. Most of the records of these debates were immediately published, such as those of Zofingen (Switzerland) in 1532, Franckenthal (Palatinate) in 1571, Emden (East Friesland) in 1578, and Leeuwarden (West Friesland) in 1590. Since these records, both of the court trials and of the theological debates, were edited by enemies of the Brethren, it is clear that this published material in the form in which it has come down to us cannot be regarded as true self-testimony. Thus deprived in the main of public literary expression, the Brethren were unable to secure a just hearing before the bar of public opinion.

But to say that the ultimate and true story of the Anabaptist movement has not yet been written is not to say that no story has been written at all. On the contrary, a story *has* been told for centuries by the enemies of the Anabaptists, a story often painted in the blackest of colors in order to encourage and justify the bloody repression necessary to throttle the movement. And the story was believed, and it was handed on down to the following generations. It was told to generation after generation of theological students from the rostrums of church history lecture rooms in the universities. It was set down in church history text books and in monographs. It was repeated in sermons of warning. The Anabaptists were held up to young theological scholars as an *exemplum horrible* of what professedly Christian folk can come to when they get out of the hands of the authorized church and its pastors and theologians. Among the common folks the fearful story of the Anabap-

tists was so vividly impressed that the very word "Anabaptist" became (and still remains in some sections) a byword, a symbol of the dark, fearsome bypaths of heresy which are to be diligently avoided, a spectre with which to frighten the weak and the careless. Throughout the Christian world of western Europe until recent times this conventional picture of the Anabaptist movement has obtained, conceived as a tragic (or horrible, according to one's feelings) aberration, a perversion of Christianity, the "deformation" of the Church as J. H. Kurtz puts it.* The picture was imported into America as early as 1668 in literary form for use by the enemies of the Baptist movement in the early history of New England, in the form of an English translation of Guy de Bres' *Rise, Spring and Foundation of Anabaptism,* published by Marmaduke Johnson at Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1668.

Modern church historians need not be told that the traditional picture of Anabaptism was a calumny rather than the truth. Earlier church historians could not have accepted the picture had they taken the time and trouble to read the original sources. When sources are neglected almost anything is possible in history writing. This erroneous conception of Anabaptism really has a triple explanation; it was based on a threefold error. In the first place historians made the mistake of accepting uncritically the testimony of the contemporary opponents of Anabaptism—the great state church leaders such as Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, as well as the lesser lights. In the second place they erred in identifying the Anabaptist movement with the Peasants' War of 1525 and the Muenster Kingdom of 1535. In the third place, these earlier historians were writing a history of the "church," of the "Kirche," not of Christianity, and for an old-time *"Church"* historian the Anabaptist or any other similar movement could be at best nothing more than a "sect", and a "sect" was an opprobrious designation of an illegitimate branch on the great tree of Christendom. As a "sect" Anabaptism could and can never be correctly conceived and justly interpreted, although in later times certain groups may have become "sectarian." A church historian with a "sect" complex has a permanent obstruction in his historical judgment.

The conventional picture of the Anabaptist movement as outlined above was created by the great Reformers in their contemporary polemical writings. There was Zwingli with his *Vom dem Touf, vom Wiedertouf und von der Kindertouf* in 1525, and his *In Catabaptistarum Strophas Elenchus* in 1528; Urbanus Rhegius

* This characterization is still to be found in the 13th edition of Kurtz's textbook.

of Augsburg in 1527 with his *Wider den Neuen Taufforden,* Melanchthon in 1528 with his *Unterricht wider die Lehre der Wiedertaeufer,* Heinrich Bullinger in 1531 with his *Von dem unverschämten fraefel, ergerlichen verwyrren und unwarhafften leeren der selbstgesandten Widertouffern.* Luther, Oekolampad, Menius, Calvin, all blew the same trumpet. After them came the lesser writers who professed to write the "history" of the movement, led by Johann Gast with his *De anabaptismi exordio, erroribus, historiis, abominandis* . . . of 1544. The extreme was no doubt reached in Dr. Christoph Andreas Fischer's shameless attacks on the Hutterites, the chief being his *Von der widertauffer verfluchtem Ursprung, Gottlosen Lehre* . . . of 1603. The standard work became Bullinger's second history of the Anabaptists, *Der Widertoufferen Ursprung, Fürgang, Wäsen, Secten,* first published at Zurich in 1560, with later editions in Latin, German, and Dutch.

But one lone voice arose in those early days to spoil the harmony of the chorus of condemnation. It was that of the tolerant, sympathetic, reasonable Sebastian Franck in his *Chronik, Zeitbuch, und Geschichtbibel* of 1531. Unlike most of the other writers Franck knew what he was talking about, for he had personal acquaintance with the movement. But his voice was as one crying in a desert; he was not heard, and he himself had to seek asylum to save his life and his family, partly because of his courage in presenting a tolerant judgment on the Anabaptist movement. For more than one hundred fifty years after Franck the conventional story of the enemies of the movement was unchallenged, until the gentle and truth-loving Gottfried Arnold, the first modern church historian, freed from the shackles of conventional "church" history by his experience in the pietistic movement, dared to study the sources and write the truth in his *Unparteyische Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie,* Schaffhausen, 1699. He was brutally attacked by the "regular" church historians and theologians as a defender of heresy, and was disregarded in general because he was a non-professional historian not of the guild. The genuine worth of his work has been recognized however by no less a historian than Ernst Troeltsch, who characterized Arnold's work as a "book which is not yet out of date, and will stand comparison with modern church histories, a work which uses an unbelievably rich store of source material, and recreates the atmosphere of extra-ecclesiastical Protestantism as no other work does."* Arnold's work proved that the

* *Die Sociallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen,* 1912, p. 800.

sources and material were available for discovering the truth about the Anabaptist movement, and demonstrated clearly that the church history of his day was too biased to be able to see and tell the truth.

Apart from Franck and Arnold the historiography of the Anabaptist movement followed its traditional course down almost to the present. I heard Professor Dr. Walter Koehler of Heidelberg say in the course of a lecture this past summer (1929) that when his generation of students heard church history forty years ago the professors mentioned the Anabaptist movement only to give it a good sound kick—"*Die Taufer* bekamen hoechstens einen Fusstritt." The Anabaptist movement was still viewed as a "deformation."

Within the past generation however the newer historiography of the reformation has shattered the older conventional picture of the Anabaptist movement. Although a satisfactory understanding of the movement has not yet been fully won, the way has been opened. Already in 1910 Adolf Harnack could say in his *Dogmengeschichte* (III., 772), "Thanks to the researches of the recent years, we have been presented with figures of splendid Christian leaders from among the circles of the Anabaptists, and many of these noble and reverend characters come nearer to us than the figures of an heroic Luther and an iron Calvin." And one modern writer, Hugo Ball, has dared to challenge church history with the claim that it is the "Reformation" which was the "deformation," the Anabaptist movement on the contrary being "the most nobly Christian expression of its age." The definite breaking through of the new viewpoint may be attributed as much as anything to Ernst Troeltsch's article "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche" in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, 1909.

I do not care to enter into a discussion of the evaluation of the Anabaptist movement at this point, but rather wish to tell the story briefly of the great strides which have been made in recent years in research in Anabaptist history which have made possible the repossession and re-evaluation of the movement. The overturn of the previous conception of the movement was the inevitable consequence of the production of evidence from the original sources that the Anabaptist movement as a whole could not be identified either with the Peasant's War or the Muenster Revolt, although it was some time before the full effect of the new discoveries was fully felt.

It was Carl Adolf Cornelius, the noted (later) old-Catholic historian at Muenchen, who was the first, in the years 1851 to 1860, to devote himself to a thoroughgoing study of the sources of a

phase of the Anabaptist movement, and who as a consequence made a clean break with the traditional conception. Cornelius' work on the Muenster Revolt, his *Geschichte des Muensterschen Aufruhrs* and allied material published during this period, proved to be epoch-making. He himself tells how he for the first time discovered and used the original eye-witness accounts of the "revolution." He was the first one to use the authentic writings of the Muensterite leaders themselves. He says he personally unearthed over 1,000 documents bearing on the story, none of which had previously been used. Cornelius was a tireless research worker, but he was also a scholar who possessed the qualities of a great historian, the broadminded sympathy necessary to sound judgment and the ability to bring his vast knowledge of general conditions to focus in a balanced way upon the field of his research. His work became epoch-making; it gave a powerful impulse to Anabaptist historiography and set a model of thoroughness and fairness which compelled imitation.

Almost at once monographs on various phases of Anabaptism began to appear. The wish which Leopold von Ranke had expressed that the Anabaptist movement be thoroughly treated in monographic form was to be realized to a great extent. The newly founded *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* and *Jahrbuecher fuer Deutsche Theologie* published noteworthy studies in their earliest issues. Names such as Heberle, Keim, Roehrich, Nippold and Meyer fall in this early period.

Another strong impulse was given to Anabaptist historiography by the work of Dr. Ludwig Keller. While the work of Cornelius was epochal and possibly of more substantial value, it was really Dr. Keller who first shook the learned world of traditional church history to its foundation on the question of Anabaptism with his thesis that the Anabaptist movement was really the continuation of a long line of independent extra-ecclesiastical Christian groups extending back to apostolic times. This thesis was defended in his book *Die Reformation und die aelteren Reformparteien* (1885). Keller did a great deal of very valuable work in the original sources, though his conclusions were at times vitiated by overzealous partisanship for the Anabaptists. Although his main thesis was never accepted, he forced church history to listen to what he said and compelled by his challenge a more thorough investigation of the entire field. A second wave of monographs accompanied and followed his work, and a brilliant group of scholars devoted themselves to the field. Some of them are still living at an advanced age; others have but recently laid down the pen in response to a higher

call. There was Emil Egli of Zurich who in his *Züricher Täufer* of 1879, and *St. Galler Täufer* of 1887 for the first time produced what approaches a more truthful picture of the Anabaptists of Northern Switzerland, i. e., in Zurich and St. Gall, the true cradle of the movement. There was Josef Beck whose monumental work on the sources of the history of the Austrian and Moravian Hutterites amounted to a resurrection of the movement for the Austrian history, in his *Geschichtsbuecher der Oesterreichischen Wiedertaeufer,* (1883). And there was Gustav Bossert, who worked systematically through the archives of the movement in southwest Germany. There were others; zur Linden and Leenderts on *Melchior Hoffman,* Gerbert and Hulshof on *Strasburg,* Rembert on *Jülich,* Wappler on *Thüringen,* Roth on *Augsburg,* Jacobs on the *Harz,* to say nothing of other and more recent monographs by Nitsche, Bergmann, Nestler, Burkhardt, Wolkan, Sachsse, Mau, Dosker, Correll, and others. A special tribute must be reserved for the nestor of all living Anabaptist historians, Dr. Johann Loserth of Graz, now (1934) in his eighty-sixth year, whose chief fame has been his splendid work on the relation of Wyclif to Hus, but who is mentioned here because of his exceptional work on Austrian and Moravian Anabaptist history to which he has devoted himself for almost fifty years. His biography of *Hubmaier* in 1893 at once became and has remained the authoritative work on that outstanding leader. His monograph on *Die Kommunismus der Mahrischen Wiedertaüfer* is notable. In a moment I shall point out his still greater service in the rediscovery of Pilgram Marbeck within the past few years. Alfred Hegler, one of the finest minds of modern Germany, whose untimely death at thirty-nine in 1902 removed the outstanding authority on German mysticism and spiritism, deserves mention for his keen discrimination between the Spiritists and the Anabaptists.

In the very nature of the case the work of English and American scholars has been secondary to that of the German historians referred to above. But I cannot forbear mentioning the valuable summary of the results of research on the Anabaptist movement by the noted Baptist historian, Dr. A. H. Newman (d. 1932), in his indispensable book, *The History of Anti-Pedobaptism to* 1609, published in 1896. H. S. Burrage's *History of Anabaptism in Switzerland* (1881) is the only monograph published in America.

As the results of modern research in the history of Anabaptism became more and more accepted, the effects made themselves felt in the revision of the interpretation and evaluation of the move-

ment. One of the first interesting results was the appropriation of the movement by the socialist historians. Karl Kautsky, the great German socialist historian, interpreted the movement as a socio-economic revolt of the masses in his *From Plato to the Anabaptists* in 1895. Belfort Bax, an English socialist writer, followed in the same vein in his *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists* in 1903. Since Kautsky practically all socialist historians have assimilated Anabaptism into socialist history.

There is even an echo of this socialistic interpretation of the Anabaptists in Preserved Smith's phrases in his *Age of the Reformation.* The Anabaptists were the "Bolshevists of the Reformation" according to Smith. H. Richard Niebuhr goes still further in his *Social Sources of Denominationalism,* much too far. Another conception of the Anabaptists is presented by Rufus M. Jones, the eminent Quaker historian and philosopher, who sees in the Anabaptists primarily a mystical group, as represented in his *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 1923.

Of more basic importance has been the sociological approach to Anabaptist history. Here the late Ernst Troeltsch in his *Die Social-lehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen,* 1912, has done ground work of the most fruitful sort. Of almost equal importance has been the sociological interpretation of the movement by the late Max Weber. It was really the fresh and vigorous interpretation of Anabaptism as a religio-social phenomenon by these two great scholars, although neither were, strictly speaking, students of Anabaptist History, which wiped away the last remaining traces of the traditional attitude toward the movement among modern historians. In their hands the Anabaptists have been largely rehabilitated in modern religious and social historiography. A splendid example of the influence of Troeltsch and Weber on the newest Anabaptist historiography is the monograph on the Swiss Anabaptists entitled *Das Schweizerische Taeufer-Mennonitentum,* (1925) by Dr. Ernst Correll, a former colleague of mine at Goshen College. Correll's work is the first attempt to secure a satisfactory understanding of the movement through a synthesis of the religious and the social approach.

Along with the rehabilitation of the Anabaptist movement, with the shattering of the traditional perverted caricature, and with the realization of the true significance of the movement, has come a revival of widespread interest in an exhaustive study of the movement on the basis of a thoroughgoing use of all the available source-material. In the fifteen years from 1905 to 1920, much less

original source-research was being done than earlier. The mass of monographic material which had been accumulated was being digested. Since the World War, however, the task of working out the ultimate story of Anabaptistism has been resumed, with promise of rich success. The stimulus has come from two sides, from the Mennonites themselves, who (at least in South Germany, Switzerland and America) for the first time in their history have become history-conscious, and from the side of German Protestant church historiography.

The center of this stimulus among the Mennonites has been the historical encyclopedia of Mennonitism called *Das Mennonitische Lexikon,* whose publication was begun in 1913, but which owing to the vicissitudes of the war and the ensuing financial depression, as well as the loss of Russian Mennonite support, is not yet more than half complete. Its editors, two outstanding German Mennonite scholars, Christian Hege of Frankfort a. m., and Dr. Christian Neff of Weierhof, in the Palatinate, are producing in the Lexikon an authoritative encyclopedia of the Mennonite-Anabaptist movement from the beginning to the present time which will be of unusual value. The Quadricentennial of the Mennonite Church in 1925, the 400th anniversary of its founding in Zurich in 1525, also greatly stimulated the revival of historiography among the Mennonites and produced a valuable jubilee volume, *Gedenkschrift zum* 400 *Jaehrigen Jubilaeum der Mennoniten,* which contains valuable studies by Loserth and Koehler, in addition to those by Hege, Neff, and other Mennonites. Christian Hege has been the driving force also behind the republication of the writings of Pilgram Marbeck which will be referred to in a moment.

In Holland Prof. W. J. Kühler of Amsterdam is about to publish an extensive and authoritative history of Dutch Anabaptism.*

The Quadricentennial year also gave birth to a quarterly review which furnishes for the first time an avenue for the publication of material on Anabaptist Mennonite history. It is THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, edited by the members of the faculty of Goshen College at Goshen, Indiana, assisted by outstanding scholars in Mennonite History such as Dr. Neff, Dr. Correll and Lic. Theol. Unruh. The REVIEW has already won for itself a recognized place of usefulness in the field. A noteworthy series of articles by John Horsch, entitled "The Faith of the Swiss Brethren,"

* The volume appeared in 1932 at Haarlem with the title *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de* 16 *de Eeuw.*

is now being published in the REVIEW. The Review numbers among its contributors such men as Loserth, Friedmann, Neff, Correll, Horsch, and others.

A very interesting phase of recent research in Anabaptist history has been the publication of hitherto unpublished sources of the first importance for the history of the Moravian Hutterite Brethren. The originals of the chief Hutterite chronicles which Dr. Beck thought lost, and which are very valuable for the study of their history, have been preserved by the descendants of the Hutterites still living "in community" in Dakota and Northwest Canada. The Hutterites themselves have begun the publication of the most valuable of these documents. The *Great Chronicle, (Das Grosse Geschichtbuch),* which covers the period from the beginning to 1923, with Dr. Rudolph Wolkan of Vienna as its editor, appeared in 1923 in Vienna. The *Smaller Church Chronicle (Kleine Geschichtbuch),* which continues the account from this point to the present, has been edited by Dr. Johann Loserth of Graz and is now in press. The extensive manuscript hymn book of the Brethren, which contains many accounts of martyrs and other incidents of great historical value had already been published in 1914. Thus the three prime sources of Hutterite history have found their way into printed form and are now available for study.

Stimulated by these publications, a number of scholars have been working on monographs on phases of Hutterite history. Dr. Lydia Mueller published in 1927 a book entitled *Der Kommunismus der Mährischen Wiedertäufer* which is, however, open to serious criticism at various points. John Horsch has contributed a brief history in English of the Hutterian Brethren to the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW, which will appear shortly in book form.* At least two doctoral dissertations are in progress on phases of Hutterite history and sociology. Dr. Robert Friedmann of Vienna has published in the *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte* for 1929 a valuable report on the archival material on Hutterite history to be found in the archives of the former Austrian imperial territories, under the title *Die Briefe der Oesterreichischen Taeufer, (Ein Bericht).* Dr. Eberhard Arnold, founder of a modern Hutterite Colony located near Fulda in middle Germany, who is now visiting the Hutterite Communities in North America on a research tour, has announced an entire series of publications of Hutterite documents and manuscripts which he has found in the possession of the present-day Hutterite communities. The manuscript

* Published by the Mennonite Historical Society in 1932 with the title *The Hutterian Brethren,* 1527-1928.

and archival material on the Hutterites is exceptionally rich, and its publication will be an event of major importance in the historical world, for the sociologist and social historian, as well as for the church historian.

I have referred several times to the rediscovery of Pilgram Marbeck, the outstanding South German Anabaptist leader from 1530 to 1555, and the republication of his writings. A name practically unknown until since the War, Marbeck has become a figure of first importance. His literary production was occasioned by a conflict with Caspar Schwenkfeld. His first work, the *Vermanung,* was printed in 1542. A lone copy has been preserved in the British Museum, and was reprinted by Christian Hege in the Mennonite Quadricentennial volume *(Gedenkschrift)* published in 1925, which was referred to above. In the same volume Loserth published a biographical study and evaluation of Marbeck based on original research. Another work, a still greater unpublished manuscript by Marbeck, his reply to Schwenkfeld under the title *Verantwortung,* written in 1544, was transcribed and edited by Dr. Loserth as his last great work, and published by Christian Hege in 1929 in a magnificent volume of almost 600 pages entitled *Pilgram Marbeck's Verantwortung auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung.* It is a powerful exposition of the doctrines of the Swiss Brethren. The work on this volume led to the discovery of another large unpublished Anabaptist manuscript in the Zurich Staatsbibliothek, called *Testaments-Erlaeuteruna,* whose transcription and publication is still to be awaited. With these publications it becomes possible for the first time to gain an adequate and systematic conception of the teachings of the leaders of the Swiss Brethren of the middle of the sixteenth century in South Germany and Switzerland. We are thus for the first time in possession of extensive dogmatic writings of the group.

But the greatest and most significant project ever undertaken in the field of Anabaptist research is that inaugurated by the German "Verein fuer Reformationsgeschichte" immediately after the World War. The Verein has undertaken a program which involves the systematic publication of all the archival material on the Anabaptist movement in the entire German language area of Europe, with the general title *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertaufer,* popularly known as *Die Taeuferakten.* This includes the lands of the former Austrian Empire as well as Switzerland and Alsace in addition to Germany proper. An admirable program has been mapped out, under the direction of the chairman, Dr. Hans von Schubert of Heidelberg (d. 1932), one of the outstanding figures

in German Protestant Church History, with the assistance of Professors Scheel, Koehler, and others. Expert editors have been chosen and assigned the various parts for preparation, and considerable progress has been made. It is to be a series of approximately fifteen volumes of 500 pages each. The first volume, that containing the Anabaptist archives for Wuerttemberg was prepared by the late Dr. Gustav Bossert, and was ready for the press as early as 1925. The extensive subsidy necessary for such a work had been promised and for a time paid, by the Prussian State "Kultusministerium." The inflation and resulting severe financial depression put an early end to the subsidy, so that at present the fate of the entire project is in the balance. The Verein has recently enlarged the scope and value of the project greatly by proposing to include with the publication of the *Täuferakten* all the published writings of the Anabaptists themselves, together with the reports of the great theological disputations of the sixteenth century with the state church theologians. The enlarged project is in effect a *Corpus Anabaptistarum,* a complete library of Anabaptist literature, including sources, a worthy companion to the great *Corpus Reformatorum* and *Corpus Catholicorum,* both now nearing completion.

The first volume of the *Taeufer-Akten* has just come from the press. It is a double volume of 1200 pages, packed full of valuable documents and records of the Anabaptist movement in Wuerttemberg from the beginning down to the Thirty Years War. This splendid first volume opens up new perspectives in the study of the movement. It indicates the great value the entire series will have when complete. Volumes on Franken, Alsace, Switzerland, Tyrol, Bavaria, Moravia, Baden and the Palatinate, Thuringia and Saxony, Silesia, the Swabian imperial cities, and the lower Rhine region are to follow. With the completion of the 15 volumes, plus the *Corpus Anabaptistarum,* it will be possible for the first time to make a thorough, comprehensive, exhaustive study of the entire Anabaptist movement of the Reformation period. Then and then only will the ultimate history of the movement, with the relation of the various groups to each other, in truth be written. Unfortunately, as I indicated a moment ago, the state subsidy for the publication of the work is no longer available and the fate of the undertaking hangs in the balance. Dr. Von Schubert informs us that without a subsidy from another source the work will have to be indefinitely postponed or altogether abandoned, in spite of the fact that much of the material has already been prepared for publication. What would be more fitting than that this subsidy should come from America where the spirit of non-conformism, toleration,

and earnest practical Christianity so characteristic of this early Reformation movement has found its fullest and freest expression?

As research in Anabaptist history progresses, especially in the publication of the original source material, the full significance of the Anabaptist movement is beginning to dawn upon us for the first time. "Before our eyes," as Dr. Von Schubert says, "a great third Reformation Church arises out of the past," alongside the Catholic and Protestant Churches—a great manifestation of Christianity, a movement which tragically was not allowed to develop its genius in the land of its nativity, but instead has found its richest fruits in Dutch, English, and American Christianity, particularly in the independent non-conformist groups which fall within the great family of the Baptists and Congregationalists, but whose genius and historical influence has extended far beyond the confines of any one religious institution.

According to Dr. Walter Koehler of Heidelberg, the deeper forces at work in our modern Christianity which have opened our eyes to the significance of the Anabaptist movement, and enabled us to appreciate its message have been two: the appreciation of the social gospel, and the recognition of the great problem of the relation of Christianity and civilization ("Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christentum und Kultur"). The Anabaptists seem modern to us in their preaching of the application of Christianity in its fullest, unlimited meaning and power to the social order. They faced honestly and sincerely, with the fullest awareness of the consequence of their position, the utter incompatibility of pure Christianity with the civilization of their day. Their solution of the problem was a complete break with the conventional society of their time. To the present time we American Christians with our optimistic evolutionary philosophy and belief in the inevitability of progress, with our identification of the Kingdom of God with this present world, and our belief in social and individual perfectibility, have perhaps not yet sensed the reality and the gravity of the great problem of Christianity and civilization, but we may some time in the not far distant future be forced to face it as the Anabaptists did. We have been shaken by the World War, frightened a bit by the moral depression, worried by the continuance of the rule of atheistic communism in Russia. Will the apparent approaching disintegration of our western culture which our Spenglers foresee mean the decline of our Christianity, or will we have discovered, like the Anabaptists, that true Christianity dare not be involved in any entangling alliances with this worldly world of ours, but must seek only the true *Civitas Dei?*

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF ACCUSATIONS OF FANATICISM AND CRIME AGAINST THE EARLY SWISS BRETHREN

By John Horsch

The Swiss Brethren of the cantons of Appenzell and St. Gall were accused by certain contemporary writers of appalling immoralities and the most offensive and senseless fanaticism. It need scarcely be said that among their antagonists and persecutors there were those who believed every evil rumor about them that came to their ears and were very willing to spread them further, or even to publish them in literary form.

Heinrich Bullinger, the chief literary opponent of the Brethren, an outstanding defender of the supposed need of persecuting them and suppressing them as a church, wrote concerning them: "In Appenzell they committed deeds of glaring shame and vice; they asserted in public that women to be saved must become gross sinners, since it is written, 'The harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.' "[1] Johannes Kessler of St. Gall, relates that some of the Anabaptists in Appenzell interpreted certain sayings of Jesus to mean that to be saved one must become childish. They amused themselves, he says, by imitating childish play, such as tying pine cones to a string and dragging them on the ground. According to Kessler they pretended that, having become like little children, they were unable to take ordinary care of themselves thus causing great disgust and offence, etc.[2] However neither Kessler nor Bullinger state that they had had first hand knowledge of these things. They did not disclose on what authority they repeated these reports. The source material of the archives of Appenzell contains nothing whatever to indicate that there is any foundation for these and similar reports of fanaticism and immorality which were circulated about the Brethren.

Charges of immorality, of fierce fanaticism, and idiocy were made not only against the Brethren of Appenzell and St. Gall, but of other cantons as well. Johannes Gast, the successor of Oecolam-

---

[1] *Von dem unverschampten fräfel,* p. 2b.

[2] Kessler, *Sabbata,* 1902, pp. 152-157.

pad, the Zwinglian reformer of Basel, made charges of the most offensive fanaticism against the Brethren in the canton of Schaffhausen. But C. A. Baechtold, a clergyman of the Reformed state church, now the foremost authority on the history of the Brethren in Schaffhausen, states that in the sources not a trace is found of any such idiocy among the Brethren in Schaffhausen, nor of the immoralities of which they were accused.[3] He adds that "the chronicler Imthurn would surely have made mention of these things if they had in his opinion even a semblance of truth."[4] At so late a date as the year 1884 the Reformed historian Strasser spoke, on the authority of Gast, of rank fanaticism among the Swiss Brethren in Basel. The book of Burckhardt on the Anabaptists in Basel, which appeared in 1898, shows the groundlessness of this accusation.

It may be worth while in this connection to notice that other denominations of that period also were slandered and maligned. Ulrich Zwingli, the founder of the Swiss Reformed state church, stated in some of his earlier writings that his followers were accused of various crimes.[5] Later, in 1531, he complained that they were accused of defending "all Anabaptist errors", that is to say, all errors with which Zwingli charged the Anabaptists.[6] Johannes Kessler wrote that concerning the Bible meetings at St. Gall, in 1524, in which he himself served as "reader", the report was circulated that "the real purpose of these meetings was gross immorality".[7] Likewise the Mennonites and Calvinists of the Netherlands were accused of being polygamists. Of Martin Luther it was asserted that he renounced Romanism because he desired license to sin, that he lived in drunkenness and other vices and finally ended his life as a wretched suicide. Again, Andreas Carlstadt was denounced as a servant of the evil one because he had dared to differ on various points from Luther. The assertion was made and believed by many that at the hour of his death Satan appeared in visible form "to fetch him."

In Austria the willingness of the Anabaptists to die for their supposed errors was explained on the theory that their leaders were in league with the devil and had gained control over their followers by sorcery. The Austrian government, in 1533, instructed

---

3 *Schaffhauser Wiedertäufer,* p. 118.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 86.

5 *Zwinglis Werke,* II, p. 321.

6 *Ulrich Zwingli; Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften,* Zurich, 1918, p. 815.

7 *Sabbata,* p. 111.

the authorities of Guffidaun, in the Tyrol, to cook the food of certain imprisoned Brethren with holy water and consecrated salt, and watch how they would behave after eating. The authorities believed that the Anabaptists were bewitched by their ministers who were supposed to give them to drink out of a little flask which had been obtained from the evil one, and this was the cause of their steadfastness in their supposed errors. The holy water and holy salt were expected to break the spell of witchery. A bishop of the Brethren in Austria, Leonard Schiemer, who was executed in 1528 by the sword at Schwatz in the Tyrol, wrote a booklet entitled, *A Reply to those who say we drink something out of a little flask; the devil knows what is in it.*[8]

To return now to the charges against the Swiss Brethren in Appenzell, among those who made these accusations of misdeeds and crimes was Ulrich Zwingli. He brought charges against them which were of so serious a nature as to offend the Council (the civil authorities) of Appenzell. These charges were made by Zwingli in a sermon which he preached in Zurich some time in December, 1525 (or early in January of the following year). In this sermon he mentioned the Anabaptists (the name commonly given the Brethren) in Appenzell, and denounced their supposed misdeeds. In a letter dated January 17, 1526, to Dr. Joachim Vadian, Zwingli stated that he had in a sermon made mention in a general way of the shameless things which were practiced by the Anabaptists in Appenzell. He said further that reports of their crimes, consisting of the most offensive open practice of lewdness, had come to him, and—Appenzell being located near St. Gall—he asked Vadian regarding the truth of these reports, since these stories were questioned in Zurich.[9] Again, in a letter to Wolfgang Capito in Strasburg, dated January 1, 1526, Zwingli alluded to the supposed crimes of the Anabaptists in Appenzell, and added, "There is nothing more foolhardy, deceptive, infamous, and shameless than these people."[10]

In confirmation of Zwingli's charges against the Swiss Brethren of Appenzell Professor Walther Koehler says that the Council of Appenzell saw itself compelled to take action. However, as the reference which he gives in this connection indicates, the action taken was confined to forbidding the meetings of the Brethren; it did

---

[8] Beck, *Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer,* p. 62.
[9] *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, 505f.
[10] *Ibid.,* VIII, p. 488.

not include punishment of transgression.[11] In taking such a measure Appenzell was simply following the example of Zurich, Bern, and other cantons. Since, clearly, none of the supposed offenders among the Brethren was taken to task, the reputation of the Council of Appenzell was at stake for failing to punish the atrocities of which Zwingli had accused the Brethren.

Within a few weeks it came to Zwingli's ears that the Council of Appenzell had heard of the sermon and the accusations in question and were greatly offended. He wrote the Council a letter of apology[12] admitting that he had preached a sermon in which he said that "at the present time the Anabaptists are making the good people of Appenzell a great deal of trouble and difficulty; they go to such length in their licentiousness that it is an open shame."

The exact wording of Zwingli's pertinent statements in his sermon is not known, though there is no question concerning the seriousness of his charges. Probably Zwingli himself did not recall the exact words he had used. His writings against the Brethren show that he was wont to use the strongest terms in accusing and denouncing them. He stated in this letter of apology to the Council of Appenzell that it had not been his intention to criticize or censure the government of Appenzell. However, the assertions which he had evidently made concerning the supposed crimes of the Brethren were in plain fact equivalent to real censure of a government which would let such things go unpunished. All indications are, as intimated above, that the Council of Appenzell could not point to a single instance in which an Anabaptist had been charged and brought to trial on account of an unlawful deed. And the Council obviously did not feel flattered by the insinuation that they had less information than Zwingli of the alleged Anabaptist crimes committed in Appenzell.

Obviously Zwingli took a lesson from these experiences with the government of Appenzell. In his last book against the Brethren, a Latin work entitled *Elenchus,* which he wrote in the year 1527, he accused them repeatedly of every misdeed in the catalog of crimes. His accusations, however, are almost wholly of a general, indefinite nature. Only in one instance he makes definite statements as to when, where, and by whom the alleged transgression was committed, namely in the case of the fratricide in St. Gall who, as we shall directly see, was not an Anabaptist. Thus Zwingli made

---

11 *Ibid.,* VIII, p. 488, Note 3; Kessler, *Sabbata,* p. 157.

12 *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, p. 523.

sure that his charges would not involve any government. Nevertheless, if any reader of Zwingli's book was aware that to all appearance no Anabaptist had been punished for crime or lawlessness, he must have thought it strange that the governments evidently had no information about these supposed crimes. There is no case on record in which a Swiss Anabaptist was punished for any transgression such as those of which Zwingli accused them.

We have indicated above that the early leaders of state church Protestantism also were slandered and maligned. However, the gross falsehoods which were spread concerning them are to-day freely recognized as such, even by Roman Catholic scholars, while, sad to say, some of the most recent Mennonite writers on this subject have assumed that the severe accusations made against the Brethren in Appenzell and St. Gall are not without foundation in fact.

Johannes Kessler, more than any other contemporary writer, has much to say about the supposed fanaticism and excesses among those who had been rebaptized in St. Gall and other places. Now, various important statements pertaining to these accusations in the writings of both Kessler and Dr. Joachim Vadian have evidently escaped the notice of modern writers on the Swiss Anabaptists. Kessler says expressly that those whom he charged with excesses and misdeeds, became guilty of these things only when they could be Anabaptists no longer. In his chronicle, *Sabbata,* he has a chapter on what he speaks of as Anabaptist aberrations, and he introduces this chapter with the statement, "When they could be Anabaptists no longer [because of the persecution], they became Catabaptists [drowners], for by their strange notions they drowned [confused and destroyed] the consciences of those who had just recently accepted the Gospel".[13] To those whom he accuses of aberrations and fanaticism he refers in this chapter and in its title as *Wiedergetaufte* rather than *Wiedertäufer* (as those who had once been rebaptized, rather than as Anabaptists), intimating that they were Anabaptists no longer.

With this statement of Kessler agrees the account given by Vadian which also indicates that the Anabaptists who remained in St. Gall after severe persecution had set in (compare the article on the Swiss Brethren in St. Gall in the October, 1933, number of the MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW) had made their peace with the state church and had forsaken Anabaptism, while those who

[13] *Sabbata,* p. 151.

stood true to their convictions had fled the city. Mockingly and derisively Vadian describes the attitude of the former Anabaptists. He says

> The swearing in of the two hundred men so frightened these holy people that their zeal abated and, in obedience to the orders of the Council, they ceased to assemble in meetings, their congregation ceased to exist, and complete tranquillity again reigned in the city. For, from this time forward, and when the Council began to exact [heavy] fines for disobedience, they yielded fully to the orders of the Council and indeed became so pliant that they could have been wound around a finger.[14]

The late professor Emil Egli, the author of the most important book on the Anabaptists in St. Gall, says that fanatical degeneration set in after the beginning of the persecution.[15] This is true and yet it is not the full truth. The statement is in fact misleading. The truth is that, as we have seen, the excesses and misdeeds at St. Gall were committed by those who had been Anabaptists but had, because of persecution, accepted and obeyed the religious decisions of the Council, which means that they had forsaken Anabaptism. The falling away from the faith of the Swiss Brethren in St. Gall began, as Vadian correctly states, as soon as it was seen that the Council had decided upon their persecution, in other words, at the time when the two hundred men were sworn in and charged with the duty to take to task any one found disobedient to the religious orders of the Council.

In 1527, when the Council of St. Gall ordered records of baptisms in the state church to be kept, it was expressly stated that this order was given that no one could say that he knew not whether or not he was baptized, and "that Anabaptism may not again over night invade the place"[16]—an indication that the territory of St. Gall had been cleared of Anabaptism. In the same year Zwingli stated that "nowhere are there fewer Anabaptists than in St. Gall."[17] There is, in fact, no evidence that there were at that time any Anabaptists in this territory; there is evidence, on the contrary, that this was not the case. At the time of the synod of the Reformed state church in St. Gall, in 1530, the Anabaptists of the adjoining territory, governed by the prince-abbot of the cloister,

---

14 "Dan demnach und man si an gelt anfieng ze strafen, liessend si die milch gar nider und wurdend so geschlacht, dass man si um einen finger gwonden hette." Vadian, *Deutsche historische Schriften,* II, p. 405.

15 *Die St. Galler Täufer,* p. 44.

16 *Sabbata,* p. 248.

17 Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 172.

were asked to present themselves for a discussion. Anabaptists in St. Gall were not mentioned: evidently there were none in the city and its territory.[18]

Obviously it would be surprising if irregularities and fanaticism were entirely absent among a people who had "permitted the hangman to teach them another faith,"[19] to use an expression of Balthasar Hubmaier. The state church had deprived the former Anabaptists of competent leadership, in fact of all leadership. The Anabaptist leaders and ministers had been imprisoned and exiled; one of them was sentenced to have his tongue cut out by the executioner. The leaders of the state church, on the other hand, had forfeited the confidence of earnest-minded people by their general attitude of compromise and inconsistency. Under pressure of persecution the great majority of the former Anabaptists had, contrary to what they believed to be their religious duty, accepted the religious orders of the Council of the city. Without question this had an unfortunate, degenerative effect on their character.

There is convincing evidence that this was generally the case when people denied their faith against their own conscience and better knowledge. Heinrich Bullinger, in his larger work against the Brethren, relates that some of the "Anabaptists" who, in conformity with the religious decrees of the state, recanted their faith, "became very reckless and wanton."[20] Dr. Paul Burkhardt, in his work on the Swiss Brethren in Basel, makes a similar statement.[21] Again, Martin Bucer wrote concerning the Brethren: "Those who yield and recant, do so as a rule against their conscience; therefore they either again join them [the Brethren] or renounce all religion and become very impious indeed, as I have seen in very many instances."[22] For this reason Bucer disapproved of using severe measures of persecution against them. Johannes Kessler says concerning the former Anabaptists of St. Gall that they became very indifferent and worldly, some of them even dissolute. "I would not have believed it possible," he wrote, "that those who

---

18 *Sabbata,* p. 356.

19 Hubmaier, in the preface to one of his books says, of Zwingli, after he had been subjected to imprisonment and severe torture in Zurich: "Me, a sick man just risen from a death-bed, hunted, exiled and having lost everything I possessed, he undertook to teach another faith through the hangman." (*Ein gesprech Balthasar Huebmoers von Fridberg Doctors, Auf Mayster Vlrichs Zwinglens zu Zuerich Tauffbüchlen,* fol. A2b. Compare Vedder, H. C., *Balthasar Hübmaier, the Leader of the Anabaptists,* p. 129.

20 "Sind hernach gar wüst und wild worden." *Widertoufferen ursprung,* fol. 15b.

21 Burckhardt, *Basler Täufer,* p. 108.

22 Lenz, M., *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen,* p. 51.

at first had made such earnest efforts striving for divine truth, could again fall into so serious errors (as the former Anabaptists in St. Gall)."[23]

Another important statement of Kessler, which church historians have overlooked, remains to be considered. Kessler ascribed some of the excesses committed at St. Gall to the Zwinglian teaching on free will and predestination. He wrote: "When they [those who had formerly been Anabaptists] were taught that man has no free will, but God does everything, as is indeed true, they fell into presumptuousness. They declared that they would neither do nor abstain from doing anything. They sat down as if they were logs of wood, and said if God meant to do anything through them, it would nevertheless come to pass."[24]

We should recall that, according to Zwingli's teaching, all that takes place is so foreordained of God. To deny this, and to believe that God had granted free will to accept or reject the preferred grace of God, was in his opinion to deny God's sovereignty. He believed that whether a man does good or evil, whether he accepts or spurns God's grace, in fact, in whatever he may do, he acts according to the will of God. In his writings Zwingli repeatedly made the statement that sin and crime are committed in agreement with God's determination and foreordination. God "drives" the thief and murderer, he says, to commit crime, and He "drives" the magistrates to punish them.[25] Obviously, these views annul human responsibility. Zwingli himself stated in one of his earlier books that the objection is raised against the doctrine of predestination that "every one will cease to do good works and even cease to do his needful daily work."[26] Michael Wiest, of Oberglatt near Zurich, who was reputed to incline toward Anabaptism, reported to Zwingli in the spring of 1526 that there were those who said they would cease to pray, "since the heavenly Father does everything, for He acts according to predestination, and not according to what we may ask of Him in our prayers."[27]

The doctrine of predestination, as taught by Zwingli and the other leading state church reformers, was offensive to the former Anabaptist dissenters. Since they had been compelled to consider

---

23 *Sabbata,* p. 162f.

24 *Ibid.,* p. 153.

25 Concerning Zwingli's teaching on predestination cf. Baur, *Zwinglis Theologie,* vol. II, p. 731 f.; Köhler, *Huldreich Zwingli,* p. 86; Burckhart, *Huldreich Zwingli,* p. 71; Köhler, W., *Die Geisteswelt Ulrich Zwinglis,* p. 146.

26 *Ibid.,* II, p. 47.

27 *Zwinglis Werke,* VIII, p. 564.

themselves members of the state church which defended such teaching, some of them yielded to the temptation to carry this doctrine into practice with a vengeance. The extravagances of these people, who under persecution had denied their faith, were blamed on the Anabaptists when, in plain fact, those who perpetrated these things had again returned into the national church.

An atrocious deed was committed in St. Gall by a man who was said to have been an Anabaptist. Thomas Schugger, by occupation a fiddler who played at dances, a shiftless fellow who, as Vadian states, had often been warned by him to turn a new leaf and show more concern for the needs of his family, killed his brother Leonard with a sword. Various contemporary chroniclers, Vadian, Kessler, Bullinger, Zwingli, Sicher, Franck, and others have written accounts of this crime. Without question Vadian's description is the most reliable.[28] Vadian was better informed than any other writer, since he officiated at the hearing given Thomas Schugger and personally assisted in disposing of the case. He gives the following description of the crime.

On the Tuesday which marks the beginning of Lent, of the year 1526, the day called "crazy Tuesday," as Vadian remarks, Thomas Schugger's father invited his many married sons and daughters to a festival at his house, having killed a calf for the occasion. They indulged in wine freely and were together all night until daybreak. Vadian says that Thomas "either had taken too much wine or had in some other way lost his accountability". Thomas was, as Vadian states further, "a tall, strong man." He seized his brother Leonard under the arms and made him kneel before him, and when his father warned him not to do anything out of the way, Thomas replied: "Your anxiety is unnecessary, for nothing can be done except that which is the Father's will [being foreordained by Him, thus professing Zwinglian orthodoxy in regard to the doctrine of predestination]." Neither Leonard nor any one else of those present knew what Thomas was about to do; obviously Thomas himself scarcely knew. On a sudden, Thomas quickly drew a short sword which he carried, and before any one could interfere, decapitated his brother with one stroke.

Needless to say, the greatest terror, confusion and tumult ensued. Thomas forthwith, without his coat, vest or shoes, ran out of the house down into the house of Vadian, the burgomaster, but

---

[28] Vadian, *Deutsche Historische Schriften,* II, p. 407f. Regarding the fairness and reliability of Vadian's report of this crime cf. *Zwingliana,* II, p. 19.

did not tell him what had taken place. Vadian states that he severely rebuked the man because, despite frequent warnings, he would not amend his life; he admonished him to give more attention to the needs of his family. Vadian gave orders that Thomas be given a coat and shoes and that he be led home to his family, for, he adds, "he acted like a madman and it was not safe to let him go unaccompanied." Word of the appalling deed reached Vadian presently. He says further that the hearing given Thomas Schugger showed him to be insane. Such is Vadian's evidently trustworthy description of this fratricide.

The account given by Johannes Kessler, which was repeated by Haltmeyer and after him by modern writers in general, differs very materially and vitally from Vadian's account of this atrocious deed. Indeed, the differences are of such vital nature that, if Vadian's account is accepted as substantially correct, the description which Kessler gives of this occurrence must be classed under the category of fairy tales. According to Kessler, Thomas Schugger pretended to be prophet and had adherents who recognized him as such. Furthermore, Kessler describes the crime as having been committed in a religious meeting as an act of divine service, the persons present being aware of what Thomas was about to do, but failing to prevent it. According to Kessler's account Leonard asked Thomas to be put to death by decapitation, for this was the Father's will. Thomas Schugger, so Kessler states further, said thereupon: "O my brothers and sisters, let us all kneel and pray earnestly that the Father may take the will for the deed." A little later Thomas asked Leonard to again kneel and pray that this deed need not be committed. It is seen then that according to Kessler's description, the assembled company were fully aware of what was to take place. This would mean that the atrocity was not merely the deed of a madman but the persons present were steeped in the most appalling fanaticism to such degree that they did not prevent the crime, but virtually participated in committing it. Again, the accounts given by Fridolin Sicher, Sebastian Franck, and others have the statement that Thomas said to his brother, "Kneel down, the Father has commanded me to cut your head off," whereupon Leonard knelt to receive the death stroke. Vadian says on the contrary, as noted above, that Thomas Schugger, being a tall, strong man, seized his brother under the arms and made him kneel before him before he gave any indication of his intentions. Thus the various accounts present hopeless contradictions.

It is of importance to notice that the description of Heinrich

Bullinger,[29] though he was a fierce opponent of the Anabaptists, agrees with that of Vadian in making it clear that the persons present had no thought of what Thomas was about to do. The same is true of Zwingli's account of Thomas Schugger's fratricide, as given in his *Elenchus*,[30] which also indicates that none of the persons present had any thought of anything perverse about to take place. Professor Emil Egli says on the authority of Kessler (contradictory to Vadian and Bullinger) that Thomas, after committing this crime, took his instrument to praise God that His will had been carried out. Furthermore, Egli says on the same authority, again contrary to Vadian's and Bullinger's accounts, that those who had witnessed the crime—mostly relatives of Thomas—praised it as a divinely appointed deed, but Zwingli states that Thomas' nearest kinsfolk petitioned the Council of St. Gall to have him executed, being evidently terribly afraid of him. There were in those days no institutions in which such persons could be placed. Thomas Schugger, "the poor fellow," as Vadian refers to him, was sentenced to death and executed.

The assertion of various writers that Thomas Schugger was a disciple of the Anabaptist Melchior Rinck is clearly an invention. Many writers have described this fratricide as intended for a sacrifice for sin. Heinrich Zschokke, in his History of Switzerland, wrote, "Thomas Schmucker, with an ax, beheaded his own brother Leonard as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world"[31]—a clearly untrue statement.

The Swiss Brethren repudiated the assertion that Thomas Schugger was a member of their church. In the summer of the year 1527, Martin Butzer, of Strasburg, reproached some of the Brethren in that city with the crime of this man. They declared with all positiveness that Thomas Schugger was not of their brotherhood and that this false charge was brought against them by their opponents to destroy their good name.[32] There is convincing evidence that this is correct, as we shall presently see. Zwingli stated repeatedly that the Brethren refused to judge the crime committed by Thomas Schugger. Obviously this means that they refused to admit that this crime was a matter of their concern. We have noticed that Vadian describes Thomas Schugger as a man of unstable character, a fiddler who played at dances and who failed to provide

---

[29] *Reformationsgeschichte,* I, p. 324.

[30] Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 171.

[31] New York, 1875, p. 135.

[32] *Vadianische Briefsammlung, IV,* p. 67; Baum, *Capito und Butzer,* p. 379.

properly for his family. There is clear indication that the Swiss Brethren did not tolerate dancing. In the confession of Martin Weniger, called Linki, which he submitted to the Council of Schaffhausen, in 1535, dancing is condemned, and Heinrich Bullinger states that Swiss Anabaptists took a radical position of condemnation against it.[33] How, then, could Thomas Schugger be a member of their church?

And Thomas Schugger, according to the general custom of the land, carried a sword. The contemporary chroniclers who wrote about the Swiss Anabaptists agree in stating that they took a strict attitude on the question of carrying weapons. Herman Miles says: "Those, whom they had baptized, they received into their brotherhood and forbade them to carry a sword and weapons."[34] Kessler: "They carried no weapons, neither sword nor other weapons, nothing more than a pointless bread knife, and said, these things belonged to the wolf's nature and should not be found on sheep."[35] Fridolin Sicher: "The men carried not any weapons."[36] An unnamed chronicler of St. Gall wrote: "They went entirely unarmed."[37] Vadian: "They taught that no Christian could take part in war, or could carry or use a sword, neither for his own benefit or for that of his neighbor."[38] Again, in the Concordat dealing with the Swiss Brethren published in 1527, it is stated that they do not permit the members of their church to carry a sword.[39] Bullinger rebukes them for the opinion that a Christian may not, according to the usage of the country in which he lives, carry a weapon.[40]

Many writers have in substance repeated the assertion of Zwingli that the fratricide in St. Gall was "the sign given by God to the Council of St. Gall to exterminate Anabaptism." Many have been of the opinion that this crime caused the persecution of the Brethren and that it excused and justified the persecution. But, as noted above, persecution had begun over one half year before this event, and it had meanwhile again ceased, since the territory of St. Gall had been "cleared" of Anabaptism. Those who had formerly been Anabaptists and had not left the city had accepted the religious

33 *Von dem unverschampten fräfel,* 1531, fol. 127a.
34 *Herman Miles Chronik,* p. 307.
35 *Sabbata,* p. 147.
36 *Fridolin Sichers Chronik,* p. 191.
37 Simler, *Sammlung,* I, p. 135.
38 Vadian, *Deutsche Historische Schriften,* II, p. 405.
39 Simler, *Sammlung,* I, p. 453.
40 *Widertöufferen ursprung,* p. 23a.

decrees of the Council and thereby become Zwinglians in the modified sense in which the state church was Zwinglian. The former Anabaptists who had accepted the religious decrees of the Council were, as a matter of course, not subjected to persecution. Johannes Kessler states expressly that there was no persecution at the time when this crime was committed. He says, referring to the time when the infamous fratricide was committed: "At this time the government of our city believed that those who had once been rebaptized held no longer to their former errors but had forsaken them. The government paid no particular attention to them but let them go about without any persecution."[41]

All writers on the Anabaptists in St. Gall have been of the opinion that the fratricide was a member of the Anabaptist (Swiss Brethren) congregation in St. Gall. Even Mennonite historians[42] have accepted this view. More than this, it was persistently charged by the antagonists of the Brethren that the crime was a natural fruit and result of Anabaptism. This was the assertion of Zwingli who, because of this crime, spoke of the Swiss Brethren as a "murderous sect."[43] August Baur, the author of the most comprehensive work on Zwingli's theology, made a similar accusation.[44] This charge was also repeated by the editors of a recent work containing selections from Zwingli's writings; they say that "Anabaptism led to not a few immoralities and even to murder."[45] Bullinger, in his larger work against the Brethren, wrote: "God, through His righteous judgment, has permitted the abominable deed of this Anabaptist to take place, and it is His desire, according to His faithfulness and love, that every one may from this unheard-of-deed learn to know and to shun evil Anabaptism."[46]

The account of the fratricide given by Johannes Kessler is important because it shows strikingly the extremes to which the calumniators of the Anabaptists have gone in their attempts to justify the state church in its attitude toward them. This does not necessarily mean that Kessler is the inventor of the falsifications which he reported. He probably wrote from hearsay. Nevertheless, the fact that he told this story as a historical occurrence indicates his unreliability in relating that which was unfavorable to the Anabaptists.

---

41 *Sabbata,* p. 159.
42 *Mennonitisches Lexikon* II, p. 33.
43 Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 171.
44 *Zwinglis Theologie,* II, 195.
45 *Ulrich Zwingli, Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften,* p. 679.
46 *Widertöufferen ursprung,* p. 32a.

It shows how slight was his concern to write the truth about the supposed misdeeds of the Anabaptists. It would have been an easy matter for him to obtain reliable information from Vadian if he had wanted to. More surprising, however, is the fact that to this day, apparently, all church historians have, on the authority of Kessler, made the deed of a madman, who was in a reality a member of the state church, an important factor in their evaluation of the Swiss Brethren movement.

THE CANADIAN MENNONITE IMMIGRATION INTO THE PARAGUAYAN CHACO, 1926-27*

Dr. Walter Quiring

The migration of Canadian Mennonites to Central and South America (1922-27) was the result of the nationalistic legislation of Canada during the World War. The Canadian Mennonites of the West who had emigrated in 1789 from West Prussia to Russia and in 1874 from Russia to Canada held tenaciously to their native German, their mother tongue. They were aided in this by a government grant of 1875 which made them a privileged group with cultural autonomy. This grant permitted them to maintain their own schools in the German language. Until 1914 scarcely any English was taught in these schools.

In the war the Canadian Government quite correctly realized that an unusually favorable opportunity had presented itself to "Canadianize" the numerous foreign racial elements which had immigrated into the country. Consequently, in 1915 the so-called "One Language Law" was passed which forbade the schools to give instruction in German. Religious instruction was also banished from the common schools and left to the various religious bodies to be conducted outside of the school system. The Mennonites were greatly disturbed by this law which would very probably transform them in a few decades into English speaking Canadians. Consequently, numerous individuals, groups, and congregations appealed to the Provincial and Dominion school authorities for permission at least to teach German in their private schools as a foreign language. However, the Government persistently refused all these appeals.

As a final resort an appeal was made to the Dominion Government in Ottawa, which was forwarded to the highest court of the empire in London, the Privy Council. The decision of the Privy Council (1919-20) was in favor of the Mennonites. The grant of privileges, according to the judgment, was binding upon the Dominion Government but not upon the provincial authorities who had independent power in the management of education. Furthermore,

* Translated from the German.

the decision of the Council pointed out that the important document granting the privileges was not confirmed by Parliament, and the copy which was in the Government archives did not agree in text exactly with the copy in possession of the settlers.

There remained now but one possibility for the German Mennonites to maintain their native language and native culture, namely, emigration. This was the decision of largest proportion of the Mennonites in Manitoba. For 85 years they had been loyal to their native culture in Russia and likewise for 46 years in Canada, and they were now ready to leave house and home a third time that they might not be compelled to be assimilated into a strange culture. It was accordingly clear that the notion which frequently appeared in the newspapers was not true which said that the Canadian Mennonites emigrated because they did not want to learn English. Rather they emigrated because they wished to remain German at any cost not only in language but in culture.

Already at the time of the passage of the "One Language Law" the Mennonites had taken up the idea of emigration, and after the final decision of the Privy Council in London had been given, their leaders at once began to look out for a land which would grant for the Mennonites to the fullest extent the privileges which they had lost in Canada, even if such a land should not offer quite so favorable prospects for economic prosperity as Canada.

The pioneer work for the emigration was the energetic and consistent activity of the so-called "Old Colony" group, one of the more conservative Mennonite groups in Manitoba. They had originally come from the "Old", that is the oldest Mennonite colony in Russia, the Chortitza Colony in the Gouvernement Jekaterinoslav, and had immigrated in 1874-76 to Canada together with the other Manitoba Mennonites.

The "Old Colony" group sent a delegation of six farmers in 1919 to Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina to investigate the possibilities of colonization. However, not a one of these countries was willing to grant them the privileges which they desired: namely, freedom from military service and absolute independence in school and community affairs.

In 1920 another section of the "Old Colony" group, from Hague in Saskatchewan, sent a second delegation to South America with instructions to go as far as Paraguay. Through a New York financier, General Samuel McRoberts, they had learned of possibilities of colonization in the Paraguayan Chaco. McRoberts had had contact with the Paraguayan minister in Washington, the later

LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

President Manuel Gondra, regarding immigration of the Mennonites into the Chaco, and was not indisposed to support the project financially.

The above named investigating commission went up the Paraguay River as far as the port of Pinasco where they followed the narrow gauge railway a short distance westward from the river and then continued further by automobile a total of 90 kilometers (about 56 miles) into the Chaco. But this dry territory did not seem to them to be adapted to agriculture so they returned to Canada with a negative report.

The report of the second commission put an end to the project of emigrating to South America so far as the "Old Colony" group was concerned. They began instead to emigrate to Mexico in 1922 where they established a colony in the next two years of approximately 4,000 persons in the state of Chihuahua.

Other Mennonite groups soon took up the project of settlement in the Chaco. In February, 1921, the Sommerfeld and Chortitza groups in Manitoba sent six delegates to Paraguay with the commission to devote special attention to the possibilities of colonization in the Chaco. They, too, had made contact with McRoberts and had received his promise of financial support.

In Buenos Aires the delegates opened negotiations with the Carlos Casado Company which owned $2\frac{1}{2}$ million hectares (about $5\frac{1}{4}$ million acres) of land in the Chaco. When the group arrived at the port of Casado, north of the above mentioned port of Pinasco, the owner of the port and partner in the Company, Senor José Casado, equipped an expedition for an investigating tour of the Chaco. In the late autumn, that is, at the end of April, the time of the year which is climatically the most pleasant because it is the coolest, the six delegates started into the Chaco. The railroad, which had been built exclusively for the export of quebracho wood from which tannin is secured, at that time extended only 60 kilometers (about 40 miles) into the interior so that the journey from the end station of the railroad had to be continued by ox cart. Indians under the direction of several white men preceded the company and cut a passage through the thick forest. The group penetrated a distance of 255 kilometers (about 160 miles) into the jungle and during the journey made shorter or longer side trips to the right or left into the forest. At the location of their westernmost camp, which was reached on the 20th of May, 1921, they fastened a wooden cross onto a large tree which is now on the land which belongs to the village of Kleefeld in the Colony Fernheim.

The delegates observed that the part of the Chaco which they had been able to investigate was covered with an immense forest of low trees interspersed with smaller or larger "pampas" or open places which totalled perhaps one-fourth of the entire area. The whole region was absolutely flat. The forest appeared to have little timber which could be used for building purposes, yet the delegates thought that there would be enough for modest houses. The attempts to dig wells for water were not always satisfactory yet here and there sweet water had been found. The comparatively long, juicy, fresh buffalo grass growing on the pampas seemed to them to be excellently adapted for pasture, although they did not know at that time that this grass was bitter and is not eaten by cattle.

The exhausting journey occupied a month so that it was the end of May before the expedition returned to Puerto Casado. The delegates at once telegraphed to the home land that "the conditions are satisfactory in every respect", and started for North America.

The delegates reached New York by the end of July but did not return at once to Canada, going instead at the request of the home group into Mexico as far as to Mexico City, to investigate colonization possibilities in several Mexican provinces. However, in their judgment, the Chaco was unqualifiedly better than Mexico, not the least also because "they would remain unmolested longer there".

In their written report to the churches in Canada, they made the following statements: "We are of the opinion that the land in general is well adapted for agriculture, stock-raising, fruit growing and the raising of vegetables. We believe that grain, such as wheat, etc., can be grown at certain times of the year. . . . We believe that this land, blessed with its various advantages and its mild climate, would be well adapted to colonization if the necessary railway connection with the port on the river is established . . . ."

The Paraguayan Government was from the beginning exceedingly well disposed toward the immigration of these capable farmers and favored the undertaking in every way possible, since it meant that an area of land would be opened for development consisting of 29 million hectares (in comparison it might be noted that Germany possesses 47 million hectares) of which the Government in 1885 had sold 5 million hectares to the Carlos Casado Company for eight and one-half cents per hectare. Already in August, 1921, the Senate and Congress of Paraguay had passed a law which un-

conditionally granted the prospective immigrants all the privileges which they had requested.

However, the prospective emigration from Canada to Paraguay was not undertaken at once. The economic crisis of 1921 brought all these plans temporarily to an involuntary end. The above mentioned New York financier, McRoberts, together with his associate, Mr. Robinette, who had been ready to take over the land and equipment of the group in Canada and trade it for land in the Chaco, withdrew from the project and the group of Manitoba farmers were not able in their own strength to finance the emigration, particularly since it was for the group a matter to be taken for granted that the poorer families would be taken along at the expense of the entire group. The cost of the trip to Paraguay was reckoned at $100 per family on the average so that for the poorer families alone $60,000 had to be provided. Another important factor in blocking the emigration was the fact that the price of land and grain in Canada had fallen more than 100% as a consequence of the economic crisis and that therefore so much land could not be disposed of in a short time without extraordinary loss.

The matter rested then until 1925, although the prospective emigrants remained in loose connection during the entire interval with McRoberts and Robinette. In that year at last new and favorable prospects for emigration appeared. The economic situation had considerably improved and Mr. McRoberts resumed the negotiations with those who desired to emigrate. He and Robinette founded in Paraguay (Asunción) a corporation under the name of *Corporación Paraguaya* (C. P.), and in Canada (Winnipeg) the Intercontinental Company (I. C.). The latter company finally, after lengthy negotiations, took over the entire land of the prospective emigrants amounting to 43,998 acres at a total sale price of $902,900.39. The price per acre varied from $6.50 to $42.00 with some of the land in the neighborhood of the towns exceptionally priced at $50.00 per acre. Of the total sale price $7.00 per acre was paid in cash to the emigrants. The balance had to be taken out in land in the Chaco which was furnished by the C. P. at $5.00 per acre. On this basis the group secured 137,920.4 acres in the Chaco. The C. P. had bought the land from the Carlos Casado Company at a price of $1.25 to $1.50 per acre.

The way for the emigration movement was now open, but the strong drive to migrate which had started the movement originally had considerably weakened during the long period of waiting. The greater portion of the group had finally accepted as their lot the

fact that their children had to learn English exclusively in the Canadian schools and that religious instruction had to be transferred to the Sunday School. One group had emigrated to Mexico already. Consequently only a minority of the Manitoba community finally decided to go to Paraguay.

On November 28, 1926, the first transport of 309 souls left the little town of Altona in Manitoba, traveled to New York via Chicago and there boarded the Steamship "Vasari" for South America. Eight additional groups rapidly followed the original transport. The list is as follows, with date of leaving Manitoba:

1.	November 28, 1926	309	Persons
2.	December 18, 1926	216	"
3.	December 24, 1926	111	"
4.	January 30, 1927	335	"
5.	April 16, 1927	336	"
6.	August 27, 1927	100	"
7.	October 16, 1927	337	"
8.	April 10, 1930	21	"

The total number of the immigrants who left Canada was 1765 distributed among 279 families.

Upon arriving in Ascunción the immigrants were warmly welcomed by the President of Paraguay, Dr. Eligio Ayala. The first group reached its goal in Puerto Casado on the 30th of December, 1926. Very little had been done by the C. P. for their reception at Puerto Casado and nothing at all for their further transport and colonization in the Chaco. The new arrivals were temporarily located in five emergency barracks near the river but most of them voluntarily relinquished these dwellings which would naturally have to be surrendered with the arrival of later groups anyway. They began to live in tents which they had brought along, or later in small huts which they built and for which the C. P. furnished lumber free of charge. A sixth barrack which was somewhat larger than the others was made to serve as a kitchen in one end and as a meeting place in the other end.

The new immigrants waited impatiently to press on into the Chaco, but the C. P. made no moves to aid them. The delegates from Canada had inspected a considerable area of land in 1921 but had not chosen the exact location for the settlement. This was to be reserved for the actual settlers. This choice, they assumed, would not be difficult as the C. P. was expected to mark the four outer boundaries of the tract or reserve which they had bought from the Casado Company. This, however, the C. P. had neglected

to do. In 1925 McRoberts had sent one of his associates to Paraguay, a Mr. March, to secure a survey before the arrival of the settlers of the land purchased from the Casado Company. However, March had not been able to agree with the survey office in Ascunción regarding the price of the proposed survey and had returned to New York without accomplishing his mission.

The representative of the C. P. in Puerto Casado at the time of the arrival of the first group was a Norwegian by the name of Fred Engen, a good-hearted man but one who lacked the necessary strength of character and firmness of will as well as the essential organizing ability to successfully perform the task assigned to him. It was the middle of January, 1927, when he organized an expedition of five people to go into the Chaco which, however, got no farther than Hoffnungsfeld, 12 kilometers (about 7½ miles) east of the present settlement, and then had to return on account of lack of food supplies. The group were pleased with the land but disappointed in the failure to discover much timber that was usable for construction purposes, for the jungle seemed to have little of it. They believed that they would be able to adapt themselves gradually to the great heat. A third group in April of the same year reached kilometer 216 (mile 135) and confirmed the judgment of the first expedition about the land. Then everything was quiet for awhile. Months went by without anything being undertaken, either by the immigrants or the C. P. In the meantime the typhus epidemic which had broken out, the return of some disillusioned immigrants to Canada, and the attempt of a small, more active group to colonize in Eastern Paraguay, diverted the group in general from its most urgent task, namely, that of pressing forward into the Chaco.

The health of the group which at the first had not been bad among the adults, gradually became less and less satisfactory. The time for the immigration was the least favorable imaginable, since the colonists came out of the severe Canadian winter directly into the high summer of the tropics. The change was so extreme that on the very first day after the arrival a child died, and on the third three children died. From that time on for months frequent deaths of children occurred. In January and February alone 26 children were carried out to the cemetery. Soon adults began to take sick. The living in close quarters, the dirty and always lukewarm water, the unaccustomed and generally inadequate diet, the unsanitary toilet facilities which were located near to the barracks, the lack of the least opportunity for bathing and, finally, not the least, the flies

and other insects, prepared the way for the catastrophe which was to cost almost 200 human lives. In April, 1927 the first adults died, apparently from dysentery. However, all the symptoms pointed to abdominal typhus although Casado and his physician, Dr. W. Walter, did not want to admit it. In September after 83 people had already died, the C. P. secured a second physician, Dr. Karl Meilinger from Encarnación on the Paraná River. Dr. Meilinger was to give medical care to the colonists on their way into the Chaco. He at once determined that the disease was typhus and ordered the most stringent quarantine and isolation of those who were sick. He also took other measures to stop the epidemic, but little could be done. The disease laid low one victim after another. Soon mound after mound appeared in the cemetery. Everyone who could started out into the Chaco, if only to escape from the infected harbor. But death pursued those who fled. People went about as in a dream with certain death before their eyes.

The plague continued until February 1928 and then gradually died out. It had raged terribly among the immigrants. Parents were sorrowing for their children and children were sorrowing for their parents. By the end of 1928 a total of 185 persons had died. This number was distributed as follows:

1.	On the journey to Paraguay	6
2.	In the port of Casado	121
3.	On the way into the Chaco	48
4.	In the newly established villages	12

But let us go back to the beginning of 1927 again. With each passing day after the arrival at Puerto Casado, the immigrants became more and more restless, and inquired more and more impatiently about the further movement into the Chaco which had been dragged out so unconscionably long. They demanded that Fred Engen should act but he hesitated. Many blamed Casado but he had nothing to do with the immigration. Nothing seemed to be of any avail. At last the immigrants wrote to Canada and requested the home group for speedy help. The home folks stirred up the I. C. and informed McRoberts. The latter, after trying in vain to handle the matter by cable, sent one of his best associates, the Vice-president of the I. C., Alfred Rogers, to Paraguay.

Rogers reached Puerto Casado at the end of May, 1927 and immediately took up the leadership energetically. However, he failed to move the settlers to determine the boundaries of their land with even the most primitive means so he returned to Ascunción to negotiate with the survey office. On the 16th of June, he

returned to Puerto Casado, accompanied by McRoberts, who had meanwhile come himself to Paraguay, called the immigrants together and decided with them to send an expedition at once into the Chaco to make the final selection of the land. But it was July before the 12 representatives of the group got started and reached kilometer 216 (mile 135) on the trail which had already been traveled three times. They followed the example of their predecessors, made short trips to the left and right of the trail, dug wells, tried to find building lumber in the forest and finally chose a territory about 200 kilometers (125 miles) west of the port as the place for the settlement. Here they found larger pampas and observed that the land was not swampy as it was in the region near the river. On the 14th of August they returned to the port and secured the consent of the entire immigrant group to their choice.

It has already been mentioned that several families had pressed on into the Chaco to get away from the harbor and in order to be near to their future homes in the interior. Already on the 12th of February, 1927, six families with 31 persons had started out to settle down somewhere. This group had been used to work and could no longer stand the idleness at the port; they also hoped no doubt to be safer from sickness away from the port. After 12 long hard days on the journey, they reached kilometer 112 (mile 70), also called Pozo Azul, constructed emergency dwellings, began to clear the open pampas of the few scattered trees and bushes on them, and prepared to plow the first fields in the Chaco.

A few days later Fred Engen with a second group went into the Chaco and reached Hoffnungsfeld. Here this group also settled in emergency dwellings and sent for their relatives to follow so that before long 30 families reached this place and a village was established.

A third group went into the Chaco and on the 9th of August reached a place about 20 kilometers (about 13 miles) beyond Hoffnungsfeld and settled at a spot called Luma Plata not far from the place where the present village of Reinland lies.

In August and September two further settlements were made, one near Palo Blanco, $1\frac{1}{2}$ kilometers from the present village of Gnadenfeld, and one at Laguna Casado.

Finally at the end of August, 1927, the survey of the land was begun. The immigrants took new courage and soon hoped to be able to settle on their own land and not waste any more time and money and above all physical strength, which is so important in the tropics. But the firm of Infram and Bibellini, which was to do the

surveying, was moving at a snail's pace. By the end of December, that is, four months, they had only progressed 53 kilometers in one direction; consequently, the C. P. cancelled the original contract with the company for the surveying and agreed upon a price of $90 per kilometer. From that time on the work suddenly went forward with speed and dispatch. But it was the middle of April, 1928, before the outer boundaries of the Mennonite area were surveyed and marked by trails cut through the forest.

In February before the surveyors had completed their work, the locations of the villages were chosen and the inner boundaries surveyed so that by the first of March the tracts of land could be assigned to the individual families. Each village was to consist of 16 to 20 farms of 160 to 200 acres in each. Each family was permitted to join the village of its own choice provided the village would receive it.

Finally, in April, 1928, 16 months after the arrival of the first immigrants in Puerto Casado, the great hour struck when the group as a whole were permitted to actually locate on their own land. The colony which was now founded received the name of Menno after Menno Simons, the early leader of the Mennonites in Holland. One village after the other was located in the forest and soon 14 were established. In the following four years (to 1932) four additional villages were established. Following is the list of villages together with the year in which they were established:

1.	1928	Bergtal	10.	"	Schöntal
2.	"	Laubenheim	11.	"	Halbstadt
3.	"	Waldheim	12.	"	Strasberg
4.	"	Gnadenfeld	13.	"	Chortitz
5.	"	Weidenfeld	14.	"	Silberfeld
6.	"	Reinland	15.	1929	Neuanlage
7.	"	Bergfeld	16.	1930	Lindenau
8.	"	Osterwick	17.	1932	Grünfeld
9.	"	Blumengart	18.	"	Grüntal

However, not all the immigrants had been patient enough to hold out during the apparently endless time of waiting. The typhus, the privation and the tropic heat, the homesickness for their relatives in Canada and for the cool weather and the wheat fields, the uncertainty about their future in the Chaco which no one could foretell, together with all the other dark sides of their long sojourn in camps along the way before they settled, made them lose heart and despair. The general dissatisfaction which was the result of various causes just mentioned finally found expression in 1927 in a

movement which had as its objective the transfer of at least a portion of the settlers to eastern Paraguay. One of the original six delegates, Isaac Funk, together with several others, traveled to Villa Rica east of Ascunción where negotiations were undertaken with a land owner by the name of Schären in regard to settlement near Pasto Rio, northeast of Villa Rica. The prospects for economic advancement seemed to them to be incomparably more favorable here than in the Chaco. Here there was good drinking water everywhere, the forest was filled with good timber, the city of Villa Rica was comparatively near and Ascunción was also much nearer than it was to the Chaco, and finally, the land was without a doubt much better and more than 60 percent cheaper than in the Chaco. But group discipline and the feeling of solidarity among the settlers was stronger than the striving of individuals to guarantee their own economic existence at the cost of the group. A few families did go to Villa Rica, but within a month left and returned to Canada.

In March, 1927, the first families returned from Puerto Casado to Canada and started a movement which was not to cease until the final settlement in the Chaco was accomplished. The high point of the movement was reached at the turn of the year 1927 to 1928 after which it gradually ebbed. A total of 371 persons returned to Canada although but very few of these returned emigrants came from the villages after they were once established.

A long row of graves marks the road of these peaceful conquerors on their way into the wilderness of the wild Chaco. At the expense of tremendous sacrifice of lives, of strength and of health, these pioneers opened for themselves and for others the hitherto undeveloped and unexplored regions of the Chaco. After six years of the most severe labor, the pampas which have been settled and a small portion of the forest have been transformed into cultivated farms, and the settlers have learned to win their daily bread from the prevailingly light soil in quite different agricultural conditions than they were previously accustomed to. But their economic future is still uncertain and the market for their products is far away and probably inadequate. So far the colonists have had a modest income through the cultivation of cotton.

[The second article which follows in the next issue will deal with the immigration of the Russian Mennonites into the Chaco and the character of Chaco agriculture.]

NOTES

A CORRECTION

The REVIEW is in receipt of a communication from Bishop George R. Brunk of Denbigh, Virginia, which contains a protest and correction of certain statements contained in the article by A. C. Kolb entitled, *John Fretz Funk*, 1835-1930: *An Appreciation*, which appeared in the REVIEW for July and October, 1932, and which takes issue with statements made by Kolb which treat of the work of the judicial committee which was established by the Indiana-Michigan Conference in 1901 to deal with the difficulties which had arisen in connection with Funk's work as bishop. Since Bishop Brunk was a member of the committee, and one of its two surviving members, the editors feel that he is altogether competent to speak and to correct the errors which apparently have crept into two paragraphs of the above-mentioned article. They, therefore, gladly give place to his corrections, believing that the readers of the REVIEW who enjoyed the original article will appreciate having the additional information, which he gives and which is essential to a true and correct understanding of the case. In the communication mentioned above, the writer refers to a discussion of this matter which was printed elsewhere sometime ago which he feels fully presents his criticisms of Kolb's presentation. From this discussion the directly quoted paragraphs which appear below are taken. It should be said that Bishop Brunk insists in his communication to the REVIEW that he "is not raising the question of motive in the case of author or publisher", but feels that he "could not be silent and thus give the brotherhood the right to think that the committee and conference own the injustice of their action". He feels that the passages in question suggest "that the church and the committee were the offending parties and that the accused was the innocent victim". The quoted Brunk paragraphs follow.

"In the July and October 1932 issues of the Mennonite Quarterly Review published by Goshen College is a biographical sketch of the life and work of Bishop John F. Funk which is worthy of permanent record except that part which has to do with the 'shadow' that fell upon his life and work after he was far advanced upon its western slope.

"Here arose contentions so serious, complicated and of such long standing as to split his home congregation and raise much opposition against him in his bishop district, the result of which was the suspension of his bishop activities for a year, by the committee, with the provision that it could then be restored by a two-thirds vote of the members of his bishop district, which failed of realization.

. . . . . .

"The impression is given [by the author of the original article] that the division of Brother Funk's congregation was healed before the work of the committee was brought to bear upon it, whereas the reuniting of the separated factions was effected as a result of the work of the committee. The writer was the junior member of the committee of five which sat in session upon this case for more than one hundred hours hearing all sides, and he trusts that it will never become necessary in order to establish the

decision of the committee as being both logical and lenient as well as scriptural, to go into details upon the matter and 'drag men's frailties from their dread abode' years after peace has been declared.

"The writer from childhood had looked upon Brother Funk almost as a super-man and in later years greatly loved and honored him for his noble work for the church, and now prizes a kindly letter which he received from him at the sunset of his life. These facts, however, do not absolve one from faithfulness in performing a work of trust and responsibility. The writer, as a bishop, has always stood ready to relinquish any charge which would fail of a two-thirds vote of confidence.

"The author of the sketch in question says:

> "There has been some criticism of the action of the committee as given above. After all, what was intended to be a complete adjustment of the difficulties referred to appears to have fallen short of this goal, for it was subsequently discovered that Funk had not been properly understood. Thus there were sincere after regrets not only among those who supported him, but also among some of those who had differed with him.
>
> "One active minister is credited with the statement made in after years, 'If ever the Mennonite Church suffered a grave mistake, it was when Funk was required to submit to the decision made in this case', while another minister, a prominent leader in the affairs of the Church wrote me, 'Bro. Funk possessed a marvelous capacity for forgiveness'."

"The writer objects to such representations being recorded as reliable history; either the author did not know the real inwardness of the matter or his kinship sympathies or prejudices betrayed him into a weak and unjustifiable attitude.

"(1) If 'some criticism' of a committee decision is sufficient grounds to exonerate an offender, and nullify the work of those set to judge a matter, then every serious trial in the world has failed, for criticisms are never lacking.

"(2) No one capable of judging such a matter would expect it to be a 'complete adjustment of the difficulties'—in such complicated matters of long standing and involving many persons and serious fault; a committee does well to successfully establish a basis for peace; time and divine grace must often be relied upon to finish the work.

"(3) There was nothing 'subsequently discovered' which would have justly altered the decision of the committee.

"(4) If a statement by an active minister is all that is necessary to decide the merits of the case it is a great pity that he was not procured at the beginning,—but in that case he would have found that there were a number of other 'active ministers' of a different opinion and the matter would be where it started. If this active minister was of the district involved, he should have presented his claims before the committee and if not, he should not have been so active in the matter. It is a law of the Church that after decisions are rendered and accepted, all agitation should cease.

"(5) The statement that 'Brother Funk possessed a marvelous capacity for forgiveness' may be true, as he had many noble qualities, but

we deny that it is here given a proper setting, for it appears to make the committee and the churches the offenders and Brother Funk the victim.

"We here record our high appreciation for the many virtues found in Brother Funk, and for the noble work which he during a long life was able to do for the Church—we draw the mantle of charity over his failings, as we would have others to do for us, and while we grieve over the shadow that fell upon him for a time, we rejoice to believe that in the eventime it was light."

The editors wish to thank Bishop Brunk for calling attention to the errors of fact and the misleading impressions conveyed by the sentences in the article which he refers to, and appreciate the privilege of being able to print the testimony of a member of the original committee in correction. They regret that they did not have the benefit of his perusal of the article before it was published. They regret also any impression which may have gone out which in any way was injurious to the committee or gave offense to its living members. Such was not the intention of the editors nor, we believe, of the author. Without doubt the committee performed very well a difficult and delicate task and there ought to be no reflection whatsoever upon their labors.

It should be said here in defense of the committee and Funk as well, that although two of the present editors of the REVIEW had the privilege of discussing the case with Funk before his late death in 1931, no word of criticism was ever heard to fall from his lips. His only regret was that in some quarters the misconception arose that he had been unfrocked (silenced) as bishop. This was not the case, as was clearly stated by the committee and brought out by the article by Kolb himself, as well as by Brunk in the second paragraph quoted above.

Funk was relieved of his charge but could have been reinstated at once by a two-thirds vote of his former parishioners for no charge had been made against his life or character. The charges dealt chiefly with methods of procedure in his bishop work. However, apparently no attempt was made to take advantage of the opportunity to reinstate him in active service by the method suggested by the committee, his friends evidently preferring to leave the matter rest.

The editors take this opportunity to state that while they do not and can not assume responsibility for the correctness in detail of the facts and interpretations offered in the articles which appear in the REVIEW, they nevertheless welcome any corrections or discussion which might contribute to a fuller or more correct understanding of the material presented and are ready to give space to such contributions.

Harold S. Bender, for the Editors.

BOOK REVIEWS

REALISM IN MODERN WARFARE

The Horror of It, Camera Records of War's Gruesome Glories. By FREDERICK A. BARBER. Published by Brewer, Warren, & Putnam, New York. 1932.

The First World War, A Photographic History. Edited with captions and an Introduction by LAURENCE STALLINGS. Published by Simon and Schuster, New York. 1933.

Preachers Present Arms. By RAY H. ABRAMS. Published by Round Table Press, Inc., New York. 1933. Pages xix, 297.

The fifteen years now past since the close of the World War have removed us from that hurricane of passion and the rattle of machine guns sufficiently to admit of a composed survey of what happened at the time. Naturally the first concern of posterity is with the results of the war. These have their horrors no less than did the war itself. However, the actual occurrences of the time have also their value for posterity. It is a commonplace that memory casts off soonest those aspects of an experience which are unpleasant and offensive. The gruesome realities of The First World War were such that the mind seeks to forget, or at least tries to hide their terribleness from direct view by drawing over them the veil of an idealized memory. Rarely can an ex-service man be cajoled into speaking reminiscently of scenes he witnessed on the fighting front in Europe.

A kindly nature has in large part healed the deep wounds which the war-god inflicted on landscapes and cities in France and Belgium. The memory of the conflict in the places where it raged is perpetuated by monuments and chapels, beautiful architectural gems in marble and granite. The chief reminder of that lavish squandering of life, of the luckless victims of shell and shrapnel, are the multiplied acres of shining marble crosses planted into the green turf and arranged into beautiful rows with perfect symmetry. These are the idealized memorials of the conflict which will impress the generations born since the war. Taught to think of war in these terms, it is to be expected that these generations will in their turn be ready to immolate themselves as victims upon the altar of Mars when sounds again the summons to war. All the soul-searing horror, the stark realities, the insane futility of the whole terrible gesture is in danger of going for nothing because the realism of warfare, especially the modern species, is being lost from view.

That this result shall not be a universal consequence and to preserve for post-war generations a minimum record of the actual realities of modern warfare, in which on the one hand human flesh and blood are so hopelessly pitted against the destroying monsters devised by technological science, and on the other hand the human mind and reason are helplessly exposed to the onslaughts of propaganda technique, for this it is to be hoped that the books noted above will serve. The first and the second of

these are photographic records of scenes in the war zones, mostly on the fighting front. The book by Frederick Barber contains eighty-nine photographs, not arranged according to any set plan, but emphasizing the inglorious end of the ten millions dead and twenty millions wounded who also once strode forth in the pomp and splendour of military gear. The photographs edited by Laurence Stallings cover 298 pages nearly twelve by eight and one-half inches in size. These views are arranged chronologically for the most part and constitute a continuous record of the war period. The captions which accompany the views in both books are very striking. Mostly single words or very brief phrases, grim and arresting as the views themselves, now laconic, now almost brutally ironical, terse and catchy, they reflect admirably the realistic phases of the awful struggle.

The third book is a realistic description of the behavior and activities of one particular segment of civilian society in the United States during the war, namely the clergymen. Graphically and powerfully, yet in a style that is sober and restrained, the author tells how large numbers of the ministers of religion not only blessed the Allied cause in the war, but actively supported all the war measures. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America became the voluntary channel through which the War Department at Washington fed anti-German propaganda to the Christian people of the nation. Much was said and written by the preachers that now seems absurd and even hysterical, of which many doubtless have occasion to feel ashamed.

One disappointing feature of this revelation is the ease with which the clergymen, and many scholars and teachers as well, the recognized intellectual and spiritual leaders of the nation, succumbed to the war psychology that was induced by planned propaganda. The fact seems clear that mere idealism and intellectualism are not an adequate prophylactic against crowd hysteria. The dynamic of religious conviction joined with an attitude of nonconformity to mass psychology are essential means for escaping participation in the wild aberrations of the mob mind.

Goshen, Indiana. Edward Yoder.

NOTICE

WANTED.—Back numbers of the Mennonite Quarterly Review. Orders frequently come from libraries for complete files of the REVIEW. Unfortunately our stock of Volume I, Number 1 (January, 1927) is exhausted. If any readers of the REVIEW are willing to dispose of their copies of this issue, we will pay fifty cents in cash or in credit toward a current subscription for them. A few copies of the issue for July, 1927, are also desired. Send them to Mennonite Quarterly Review, Goshen, Ind.